

drugs, i) anaphylaxis, j) autoimmune disease, and k) organ transplant rejection/allo or xeno tissue transplant rejection.

Applicants elect, with traverse, Group I, Claims 1-16 and 18-19. In addition, Applicants elect, with traverse, atopic dermatitis as single disclosed species of an allergic disorder. Claims 1-20 read on the elected species.

Restriction is only proper if the claims of the restricted groups are either independent or patentably distinct. The burden of proof is on the Office to provide reasons and/or examples to support any conclusion with regard to patentable distinctness. MPEP §803.

However, the Office has not provided sufficient reasons and/or examples to support a conclusion of patentable distinctness between the identified groups or shown that a burden exists in searching all the claims.

Moreover, the MPEP in §803 states as follows:

“If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without a serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.”

Applicants respectfully submit that a search of all the claims would not impose a serious burden on the Office.

Further, MPEP §821.04 states, "if applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined." Applicants respectfully submit that should the elected group be found allowable, the non-elected claims should be rejoined.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Election of Species Requirement on the grounds that the Office has not provided any reasons, whatsoever, to support the conclusion of patentable distinctness. Rather, the Office has merely stated the conclusion.


Applicants make no statement regarding the patentable distinctness of the species, but note that for restriction to be proper, there must be a patentable difference between the species as claimed. MPEP §808.01(a). The Office has not provided any reasons or examples to support a conclusion that the species are indeed patentably distinct. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the restriction is improper, and Applicants' election of species is for examination purposes only.

Finally, with respect to the elected species, Applicants respectfully submit that, should the elected species be found allowable, the Office should expand its search to the non-elected species.

Applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified application is now in condition for examination on the merits, and early notice of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

  
Norman F. Oblon  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No.: 24,618

Kirsten A. Grueneberg, Ph.D.  
Registration No.: 47,297



**22850**

PHONE NO.: (703) 413-3000  
FAX NO.: (703) 413-2220  
NFO:KAG:lcd:scs

I:\user\KGRUN\00181098.rest.elect.resp.wpd